

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 and 5-22 are pending. Claims 1-3 and 5-20 have been amended, claim 4 has been canceled, and new claims 21 and 22 have been added to recite additional features of the embodiments disclosed in the specification. In addition, Replacement Sheets have been submitted to overcome the drawing objections and the specification has been amended for clarity.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

#### **I. The Drawing Objections**

The Examiner found the drawings to be objectionable for the following reasons:

Figures 1 and 2 contain the legend "Related Art" instead of "Prior Art" as proposed by the Examiner. Figures 1 and 2 have been amended to include the legend "Prior Art."

Figure 7 does not clearly identify the connection path between elements 30 and 710. Figure 7 has been amended to show this connection more clearly, i.e., a line has been drawn to connect reference letter "b" to the line connecting mobile terminal 30 and agent 710.

Replacement Sheets for Figures 1, 2, and 7 have been submitted with this paper to include the aforementioned amendments to the drawings. Withdrawal of the drawing objections is requested in view of these Replacement Sheets.

## **II. The Objections to the Specification**

The typographical errors on page 3 and Table 1 have been corrected. Applicants submit that the disclosure on page 23, [0071], is clear from Figure 7. In this figure, agent 710 is shown as being connected to elements other than mobile terminal 30, e.g., internet 20 and GGSN 300.

Also, the encircled 1 in Figure 7 is adjacent the line directly connecting agent 710 and internet host 720. The placement of this encircled 1 when read in view of the specification makes clear that the encircled 1 corresponds to the line connecting agent 710 and host 720. (Applicants further note that agent 710 may connect to internet host 720 through an alternate path passing through internet 20).

Withdrawal of the objections to the specification is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and explanation.

## **III. The Rejection under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claim 20 on grounds that the specification fails to enable operation of the internet host connected between the agent and the Internet for enabling internet subscriber and mobile terminals connections to the agent. Applicants submit that this operation is clear in view of Figure 7.

In Figure 7, the internet host may be used to connect mobile terminals to the agent through a path which passes from element 30 to agent 710 though GGSN 300. The mobile terminals connect to the GGSN along the dotted path "a," and the GGSN is connected to the

internet host 720 through internet 20. Finally, from the host is connected to the agent 710 through encircled path 1. Applicants submit that this explanation is sufficient for overcoming the § 112, first paragraph, rejection.

#### **IV. The Rejection under 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 1-20 were rejected for being unclear as follows:

In claim 1, the phrase to “set a terminating call ...” is unclear as well as the phrase “packet terminating call.” To clarify these features, the word “terminating” has been deleted from the claims. In view of these amendments, the claims now recite controlling a “packet call,” by “determining whether to set a call connection of the received packet ...”

Claims 8 and 12 have been amended to remove the forward slash between the noted claim terms.

In claim, use of the phrase “and/or” was alleged to be unclear, e.g., it is unclear whether this claim is reciting inquiring and updating or inquiring or updating. The answer is both. The invention may inquire or update the registered pack call filtering information, or inquire and update this registered packet call filtering information. These features are clear from the specification. (See, for example, Paragraph [0062]). Use of the “and/or” term in claims 18 and 20 is clear for similar reasons.

In claim 14, the Examiner has objected to use of the phrase “static information.” Applicants submit that this phrase has clear and definite meaning, both to those skilled in the art and in view of the specification. For example, the specification discloses that “static information” may include the types of information described at Paragraph [0042] of the specification, although the claims are not to be limited to this type of information.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite “filtering information from an Internet subscriber or a mobile terminal” in order to clarify the ambiguity pointed out by the Examiner.

Withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph, rejection is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

**V. The Rejection under 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1-6, 14-16, 18, and 19 were rejected for being anticipated by the Uskela patent.

The Uskela patent discloses blocking packets transmitted between a mobile terminal and an internet website. The packets are blocked based on a screening list stored for a subscriber of the mobile terminal. The list is used by a gateway node to determine whether a packet, having the mobile terminal as its destination, is to be blocked, based on a connection endpoint identifier (CEI) included in the packet. The CEI may be a port number and/or an internet address. Based on this comparison, the packet is either permitted to pass to the mobile terminal or is blocked.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite registering packet call filtering information for at least one subscriber, the packet call filtering information including “a plurality of combinations of packet-pattern attributes, each combination assigned a different security classification and including different arrangements of said attributes.” (See, for example, Table 2 on page 15 of the specification).

In addition to these features, claim 1 recites that if a packet addressed to the subscriber as a destination is received, determining whether to set a call connection of the received packet based on “a comparison of attribute information of the received packet and the plurality of combinations of packet-pattern attributes included in the registered packet call filtering information.”

The Uskala patent does not disclose the features added by amendment to claim 1. That is, Uskala discloses storing a screening list accessible by a gateway for blocking packets transmitted to a mobile terminal from an internet website. This screening list includes CEIs that include a port number and/or an internet address. However, Uskala does not store a plurality of combinations of packet-pattern attributes, each combination assigned a different security classification and including different arrangements of said attributes. Nor does Uskala determine whether to set a call connection based on a comparison of those combinations with information in a received packet.

Because the Uskala patent does not disclose all the features of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Uskala does not anticipate this claim or any of its dependent claims. Claim 19 has been amended recite features similar to those added by amendment to claim 1, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 and its dependent claims are also allowable.

**VI. The Rejection under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 7, 9-11, 17, and 20 were rejected for being obvious in view of Uskala taken alone. Applicants submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 19 respectively.

Claims 8, 12, and 13 are also allowable on grounds that the Puuskari publication does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 missing from the Uskala patent.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 10/634,910  
Amdt. dated July 30, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of May 1, 2007

Docket No. K-0528

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and  
please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros  
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw

**Date: July 30, 2007**

\\Fk4\Documents\2016\2016-609\128465.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**